

On Rotating a Qubit

Subhash Kak

Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803-5901; kak@ee.lsu.edu

February 1, 2008

Abstract

The state function of a quantum object is undetermined with respect to its phase. This indeterminacy does not matter if it is global, but what if the components of the state have unknown relative phases? Can useful computations be performed in spite of this local indeterminacy? We consider this question in relation to the problem of the rotation of a qubit and examine its broader implications for quantum computing.

Introduction

Quantum mechanics provides us a means of extracting information about a physical system, but this information depends on the manner in which the system is prepared and the measurement apparatus deployed. The state function of the system is defined on the complex plane whereas the observations can only be real, which means that the state function cannot be completely known.

Quantum computing algorithms as visualized now proceed with the register in a pure state. Normally, this state is taken to be the all-zero state of n -qubits: $|0\rangle|0\rangle\dots|0\rangle$, or 2^n amplitudes $(1, 0, 0\dots 0)$, which by a process of rotation transformations on each qubit is transformed into the state with amplitudes $(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\dots\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}})$, where $N = 2^n$. It is implicitly assumed that the phase uncertainty in each of these states is global, and so it can be ignored.

Is this assumption realistic? Can the cost and realizability of the initial pure state and its rotations to the superposition state be estimated? This

problem was considered in a recent paper [1], where the author discussed its implications for initializing the state of a quantum register. We return to this problem here to clarify several points related to preparation of pure states and to focus on the difficulty of controlling the evolution of a quantum state, which is essential to do in a useful quantum computation.

The cost of preparing a pure state

A pure state is one which yields a specific outcome in a given test designed to elicit the maximum number of outcomes associated with the system [2]. Examples are Stern-Gerlach experiment for spin or the use of a calcite crystal for photon polarization. It is reasonable to represent the all-zero state by $(1, 0, 0 \dots 0)$, if it is assumed that each of the qubits has been prepared identically and there is no dynamical evolution. In other words, it is assumed that qubits emerging out of the state preparation apparatus are frozen in their state and installed at the appropriate locations in the quantum register.

It is important to note that a dynamically evolving pure state remains a pure state, since pure states are analogous to unit vectors along a set of orthogonal basis vectors, and any vector in the N -dimensional space can be taken to be one of the basis vectors.

From an information-theoretic point of view, a transition from the initial $(1, 0, 0 \dots 0)$ state to the $(1, 1, 1 \dots 1)$ superposition state is equivalent to a transition to some other $(z_1, z_2 \dots z_N)$ state (where z_i s are arbitrary complex numbers and it is assumed that the amplitudes are to be normalized), because each of the final states will be obtained by the application of a suitable unitary transformation. Many authors have assumed that the latter state, with the unknown z weights, is *more* “complex” in some fundamental way. The reason behind this mistaken view is the fact that it is easy to obtain the superposition state $(1, 1, 1 \dots 1)$ mathematically by the use of elegant rotation transformations on the qubits, individually [3, 4]?

The n -qubit vector is a tensor product of the n individual qubit vectors. As there is no reason to assume that the relative phase between the superposed states is zero, the individual qubits should be written as $z_{i1}|0\rangle + z_{i2}|1\rangle$. The n -qubit state will then have $N - 1$ unknown relative phases and one global unknown phase.

It is common to ignore the relative phases in state vectors for ensembles, because in repeated measurements the unknown phases can be assumed to average out to zero. However, in quantum computing we speak about individual quantum system and so this averaging out is not permissible.

In entangled states the phases do have definite relationships. But the qubits that go into the formation of the n -qubit state vector are not permitted to be entangled for computationally useful operations to be performed on them.

Preparing a qubit

For simplicity, we consider a qubit to have the form $|\phi\rangle = \alpha e^{i\theta_1}|0\rangle + \beta e^{i\theta_2}|1\rangle$, where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$. A qubit may be prepared by starting with an available component or superposition state and transforming it into the desired superposition state by applying a unitary transformation.

The simplest way to prepare a pure state is to subject qubits to a test and discard all the qubits that do not yield the desired outcome. Pure states are unit vectors along a set of orthogonal axes, and two examples are $e^{i\theta_1}|0\rangle$ or $e^{i\theta_2}|1\rangle$ at angles of 0 or 90 degrees; other orthogonal axes can likewise be chosen. The standard basis observables are $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$.

To consider different ways of initializing qubits, assume that the starting pure state is $|0\rangle$, determined excepting an arbitrary phase angle. One can obtain a superposition state by use of a rotation operator which, in its most general form, is the following matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} \alpha e^{i\theta_1} & \beta e^{-i\theta_2} \\ \beta e^{i\theta_2} & -\alpha e^{-i\theta_1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

where θ_1 and θ_2 are unknown phase angles. This leads to the superposition state

$$\alpha e^{i\theta_1}|0\rangle + \beta e^{i\theta_2}|1\rangle \quad (2)$$

Here we ignore the fact that the initial state will have some uncertainty associated with it due to the impossibility of a perfect implementation of the angle of the basis vector. Furthermore, the presence of noise and entanglement with the environment imply that the superposition state will not be completely controllable, and these questions are also ignored here. If it can be arranged that $\theta_1 = \theta_2$, then any appropriate rotation can be achieved. But we have no means of ensuring this equality, excepting by the use of entanglement which would defeat our purpose.

If we rely on the simpler method of starting with a pure state as a unit vector in the 45 degree direction, such a pure state, when viewed from the axes at 0 and 90 degrees, will be defined as

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e^{i\theta_1}|0\rangle + e^{i\theta_2}|1\rangle) \quad (3)$$

This pure state will resolve into the basis states in the directions of 0 and 90 degrees with equal probability.

Is there a way to rotate a qubit by any specific angle? For convenience assume that the operator

$$M = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

is implementable. When applied to the qubit $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$, it will lead to the pure state $|0\rangle$. But since the qubit should be realistically seen to be $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e^{i\theta_1}|0\rangle + e^{i\theta_2}|1\rangle)$, an operation by M will take the qubit only to

$$\frac{(e^{i\theta_1} + e^{i\theta_2})}{2}|0\rangle + \frac{(e^{i\theta_1} - e^{i\theta_2})}{2}|1\rangle \quad (5)$$

The probability of obtaining a $|0\rangle$ will now be $\frac{1}{2}[1 + \cos(\theta_1 - \theta_2)]$, whereas the probability of obtaining a $|1\rangle$ will be $\frac{1}{2}[1 - \cos(\theta_1 - \theta_2)]$. The probabilities for the basis observables are not exactly $\frac{1}{2}$, and they depend on the starting *unknown* θ values. Thus, the qubit can end up anywhere on the unit circle. As example, consider $\theta_2 = 0$, $\theta_1 = \pi/2$, the probabilities of $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ will remain $\frac{1}{2}$ even after the unitary transformation has been applied!

If one assumes that $\theta_1 - \theta_2 = \theta_d$ is uniformly distributed over 0 to π , the probability of obtaining $|0\rangle$ turns out to be $\frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{y-y^2}}$, where y ranges from 0 to 1. The expected value of this continues to be $\frac{1}{2}$.

If we consider the rotation of qubit (2) by the unitary operator (4), we get the following probabilities $\frac{1}{2}[1 + \alpha\beta\cos(\theta_1 - \theta_2)]$, $\frac{1}{2}[1 - \alpha\beta\cos(\theta_1 - \theta_2)]$, for obtaining the states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ respectively. In other words, the fundamental phase uncertainty makes it impossible to calibrate rotation operators. The operator (4) is unable to rotate the pure state (3) by 45 degrees.

Since the rotation of qubits is visualized to be done in stages in the currently conceived implementation schemes, any of these gates can introduce phase uncertainty that will be impossible to compensate for in the ongoing unitary operations.

Conclusions

Rotation operations are basic for the implementation of the currently envisaged quantum algorithms. Lacking information regarding phase of the qubit, it is clear that these operators will not work correctly. Furthermore, each gate will introduce its own random phase uncertainty because the operation $A|\phi\rangle$ and $Ae^{i\theta}|\phi\rangle$ are indistinguishable. As example of this, consider the unitary operator $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$ which has been proposed to make the relative phases of $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ flip. Even assuming that the original qubit was $\frac{e^{i\theta}}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$, the new phases become θ and $\theta + \pi$, which cannot be characterized phase reversal. Since the initial phases have uncertainty, one cannot steer the qubit to a desired change.

Error correcting codes cannot be used to correct this uncertainty because it is without bound. Furthermore, if error correction worked for this problem that would allow for us to make the relative phases zero, which gets us more than what quantum theory allows.

On the other hand, if the initial phase uncertainty can be lumped together then an appropriate sequence of unitary transformations will, in principle, steer the state to the desired solution. The challenge then will be the physical implementation of this transformation in a manner so that this lumped uncertainty doesn't diffuse to the constituent qubits in an uncontrolled way. But even if this could be done, does the lumping together of the phase uncertainty imply limitations with respect to implementation that will drastically reduce the advantages of quantum computers?

References

1. S. Kak, "The initialization problem in quantum computing," *Foundations of Physics* 29, 267 (1999).
2. A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*. (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1995).
3. P.W. Shor, "Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer," *SIAM J. Computing* 26, 1474 (1997)
4. L.K. Grover, "Quantum mechanics helps in searching for a needle in a haystack," *Physical Review Letters* 79, 325 (1997).